

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1860.

NO. 19.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 439 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Hogers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-trade, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, domestic, business arrangements, and aims of life—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promise; our pasoply, the whole armor of God.

Our Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

Way-marks in the Moral War with Slavery.

BY REV. HENRY T. CHEEVER.

No. VII.

The last article by the *Maine Evangelist*, upon the Logical Fallacies of the *Independent*, is so much to the point, that I offer it almost entire for the columns of THE PRINCIPIA. The reasons will be apparent why it should find a place in a series of "Way-marks in the Moral War with Slavery." It good-humoredly opens thus:

We think the church would do well to choose a committee to frame a suitable reproof of the *Independent's* sinless slaveholder, (see our last article on this subject) and adjourn for a week. If slavery be a "tremendous wrong" surely there can be some way of designating the wrong doers, and fixing the blame on them. It must be admitted, however, that our brethren who affirm the sin of slavery, but deny it of slaveholding, are not at all agreed as to how the wrong doer shall be designated. Aside from the declarations already noticed, there are several others which the committee may consult. A Baptist Association resolves that "slavery—the voluntary holding of one human being by another as property, is a great crime against God and humanity." At the same time they resolve against the "manufacture, traffic and use of ardent spirits as a beverage," without the precaution of saying it must be voluntary, which was probably an oversight.

The General Convention of Presbyterian and Congregational churches in Wisconsin say "the voluntary claim made by one human being on another as property is sin."

The *Congregationalist*, reproving us kindly for our lack of discrimination, and pointing out in several articles the necessary distinctions, fixes on this, that "voluntary slaveholding is sin and should be treated like other sins." Our error it seems lies in omitting this word *voluntary*. Perhaps the committee will fix on this and lay it before the church at their adjourned meeting, in the form of a resolution. We will step into the Church Meeting. The Committee report the following:

"Resolved, That voluntary slaveholding is sin and should be treated like any other sin."

It seems likely to pass, but a brother rises and says: "Brethren I do not doubt the truth of this resolution. But I do not like the addition of that word *voluntary*, in which only it differs from one formerly proposed and rejected. It may do no harm, but if harmless it is needless. Is not all sin voluntary? and is it not so understood of course? Does any one think of blaming a man for what is not voluntary—the result of his own volition or choice? Does not Dr. Taylor say that 'the true principle of Orthodoxy is that sin or guilt pertains exclusively to voluntary action.' If our erring brethren should understand this word in the sense we use it, it is needless and suggests only a truism. But it may not be harmless. Unfortunately this word is much less definite than slaveholding. Webster gives but one definition to the latter, namely:—'holding persons as slaves.' But to the word *voluntary* he gives several, one of which is 'acting without being influenced or impelled by another.' Now we know that there is not a slaveholder who is not influenced by others. Not one of them probably would hold slaves, if he stood alone. There is not one of them who continues to admit that the system is evil, but regards himself an *involuntary* slave-

holder.—I object not without reason; for the history of the churches for the last fifty years shows that the application of this elastic word or its equivalents, to their declarations against slaveholding has allowed it a covert under which it has increased until it asks no protection. —More than forty years since, the most intelligent religious body of the South, (the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church) declared that the *voluntary* enslaving of our fellow men is a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature, and of the law of God. But slavery continued to increase among them, and the last we hear from them is in the declaration of the Old School that they adhere to that declaration, and also at the same time affirm that slaveholding 'as it exists in this country is no bar to church fellowship.'

Now, do they mean to say that a gross violation of the rights of human nature and of the law of God is no bar to church fellowship? Not this, I presume, but rather that as it exists in this country it is not voluntary, probably for the reason that it is entailed upon them by their ancestors. I am the more convinced that this is their meaning, from the fact that the New School branch of the original Assembly, which professes to regard the system as evil, and for this reason has lost a part of their slaveholding constituency, recently declared that 'slaveholding except when *unavoidable* by the laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship or the demands of humanity is an offence.' And the slaveholding Presbytery of Winchester has notified the Assembly that the exceptions stated in their resolutions are considered to cover the vast majority of cases of slaveholding. Of course what is *unavoidable* is *involuntary*. Of what use then to send word to our erring brethren that we deem *voluntary* slaveholding a sin? If they notice us at all, it will be to say 'so we believe, and have long ago declared. But we are not voluntary; our slaveholding is *unavoidable*.' I cannot vote for the resolution."

Closing remark by the pastor. "Brethren, I have thought that in view of this towering evil and sin, it was our duty as Christians and a church to say something in reproof of those who are responsible, and in favor of God and humanity. If we were disposed to let it alone, it will not let us alone. Considered merely as a natural evil it affects us injuriously, but this is nothing to be compared with its influence as a moral evil in perverting the moral sentiments and breaking down the fundamental principles of justice and righteousness here at the North. We ought also to remember those in bonds. But I confess I do not see that we can say any thing to the purpose, that will be permitted to reach those for whom it is intended. Our self-respect forbids us to utter mere truisms with grave deliberation. Our Oberlin brethren are opposed to slavery, no doubt. They prefer 'the popular statement—slavery is wrong—the system unjust and mischievous.' But at the same time they say truly, that moral wrong always involves *evil intention*. But neither slavery nor the system, considered as distinct from slaveholding has any intention, good or evil.

Besides, ever since I can remember, the whole country, North and South has been thrusting at the system, calling it all sorts of hard names, until finally one-half have come to the conclusion that it is *right*. I would prefer to say that *slaveholding* is sin, for if there be any sin in the case it is in the holding; if any evil intention it is in the holders. But if we say this, our good brethren will never let it reach those for whom it is intended. Before it gets out of New England they will interpose the shield of their discriminating charity and send it back to us with a gentle rebuke for our logical fallacies and lack of moral discrimination. But they are not at all agreed as to what we ought to say or how to designate the sin. Whether it is 'slavery,' or 'the system,' or 'voluntary holding,' or 'the voluntary claim to hold.' They are only agreed that we must not say that slaveholding, the only real, actual sin in the case is sin. Besides our Boston brethren who say that *voluntary* slaveholding is sin and to be dealt with like other sins, recommend to us the example of Christ and his apostles, affirming that they never said anything directly against slaveholding, and I am sure they were equally cautious not to say any thing against *voluntary* slaveholding or the *system*. Will it not be wise brethren to say nothing, and leave the matter in the hands of Mr. Garrison, the Tract Society, the politicians and future John Browns, and see what will come."

Adjourned sine die.

Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, that there is a terrible wickedness and oppression, a dreadful wrong committed in the land, overclouding its prosperity, perverting its morals, threatening our destruction, provoking the God of nations, but Christians cannot unite in op-

posing it by moral influence because they cannot agree how to designate the authors of the wrong!

For the Principia.

The Constitution, Written and Unwritten.

NUMBER I.

A Constitution may be embodied in a written form, and arranged into articles and sections, or, like the British Constitution, it may consist of principles not so embodied, but which have acquired such authority, as to be the rule of legislation and judicature. We know a written Constitution which stands in a deserted temple, fair and majestic, with LIBERTY over its entrance. We know an unwritten one, of hideous structure, where Senators, Judges, and politicians throng for the worship of despotism. But the task before us forbids allegory, and requires plain statements.

The Convention that framed the Federal Constitution, had within itself, an influence hostile to the objects of that instrument. The Convention is said to have been composed chiefly of slaveholders. Certainly, it had no lack of representation for the slave interest. Sentiments adverse to liberty and right, were freely uttered within the closed doors of that body. The slave trade was spoken of as a "right" of the States. With reference to it, Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina, said: "Religion and humanity had nothing at all to do with the question." Mr. Ellsworth of Connecticut, said: "Let every State import what it pleases." A convention that could tolerate the free utterance of such sentiments, would hardly be trusted for a decidedly anti-slavery instrument. But the convention acted for an anti-slavery people, A Constitution, to be acceptable to them, must be adapted to a state of society in which no slavery exists. It must promise justice and liberty, without appearing to favor slavery. Such an instrument was produced, and, with some amendments, adopted. If it contained anything to favor slavery, the intention was disguised by its terms, and so contradicted by the plainest language of the instrument that to satisfy the instrument was not to satisfy the intention, and to support the instrument was to defeat the intention. In short, slavery was excluded, and no honest entrance left for it.

Yet the whole system got in, through a small hole of its own making. How was it done? By changing the use of the term, "free person." The change was favored in the framing convention. By the established legal use of the term, "free person" meant one who is invested with the full privileges of citizenship, in distinction from aliens and others not so invested. It did not suggest the idea of a *slave* as its opposite. The change was easy. The actual existence of slavery, made it natural to use the term *free person* to denote one who is not a slave, thus implying that all who are not free persons, are slaves. The purpose of slavery was secured by the change. It led to other perversions. For when you admit that slavery is recognized and respected by the Constitution, you are prepared to admit every construction which the security of that interest requires. It has been told that a boy saved a city of Holland from inundation, by holding his hand, for long weary hours, in a little channel, through which the waters of the ocean had begun to trickle across a dike. Not more did that city need the protection of the devoted boy's hand, than the American people needed a vigilant guard to exclude from the Constitution, the slightest construction favorable to slavery. Give slavery the least footing in a Constitution, and then keep it from being a dominant interest, if you can.

The perversion of the Constitution has carried along with it, the perversion of the national mind, for when you have made slavery appear Constitutional, you have gone far to invest it with a kind of sacredness, in the eyes of the nation, and just so far you have weakened the sentiment of

natural justice and inalienable right. Any Constitution which a people adopt and adhere to, will react upon them with an assimilating power. If, by its terms, or by perversion, it favors injustice, what can be its educational effect, but to turn the moral sense of the people upside down, and make them feel that right is not always inviolable, and that a political compact may make an act of injustice obligatory? In opposing a bill for the benefit of fugitive slaves, a member of the Vermont legislature, said: "We must not legislate according to our feelings." Doubtless he thought political duty was paramount, and that our "feelings" of justice must yield to the Constitution. If so, his notion was neither singular nor unaccountable. This member was a lawyer. But how must his perceptions have been perverted, to blind him to the fact that the Constitution does not seek to cross our sense of justice, but to gratify it.

In our Union, political doctrines, the growth of slavery, control every department of Government. Though not arranged and numbered as articles, they are, in effect, an unwritten Constitution, antagonistic to the written. The written Constitution is a very explicit agreement of "the people of the United States," to be restrained from acts of injustice and from depriving one another of liberty. The unwritten Constitution authorizes one portion of the people to enslave a much larger portion, and treat them with any measure of injustice, while all the rest of the people are forbidden to interfere. The written Constitution perfects the union of the people and States, under one government, for the purpose of securing to them the blessings of liberty; the unwritten, forbids any interference of this one government within those States, for such a purpose. The written Constitution forbids any person to be deprived of liberty, without due process of law; the unwritten, authorizes enslavement without law, or suspicion of crime. In the written Constitution, the slaveholder joins with the rest of the people, in declaring an intention to have justice established, and liberty secured to the people, his own slaves being a portion of them. He concurs in certain personal securities equally protective of himself, and them. Under the unwritten Constitution, he claims a despotic right, which is secured to him of defeating his own written intentions, and it would be deemed a breach of "honor and good faith" to hold him to his written engagement of justice and liberty, or execute the written bond against him! The written Constitution, knows nothing of complexions, the unwritten, is proscriptive to black people. The written Constitution has a preamble, to explain its purpose of justice and liberty; the unwritten, forbids any use of it. *In short, all the provisions of the written Constitution are for liberty; all of the unwritten for slavery.*

Either of the Constitutions is consistent enough with itself, but jumble them together, as politicians do, by their constructions of the written instrument, and you make a mass of contradictions, which neutralize the good, while despotism gives effect to the evil. *Think, for instance, of the worse than useless absurdity of States, confederated for the purpose of securing liberty to the people, yet severally holding a reserved right to enslave them!* Our chance for good government, is poor enough at the best. Government needs all the restraints of a wise and consistent Constitution, to keep it to its true mission. Despotism can take care of itself, and needs no Constitutional securities. To provide for the security of liberty and slavery in the same instrument, is like putting the sheep and wolf together in the same fold. Keep the wolf out, if you would save the sheep. There will be danger enough then. With the wolf in, the sheep are sure to be destroyed. I. S.

For "The Principia."
Anti-Theological Fallacies.

MR. EDITOR:—If you can afford the space in your little paper, for the article I send you to-day, on "Logical Fallacies," clipped from the *Maine Evangelist*. I think it will both instruct and gratify your readers.*

The Independent would have appeared honest and magnanimous, by copying this article, because it is a just, though severe comment upon the "malum in se nonsense." The wicked and fatal theological compromise with slavery, made popular by the prestige of some of its authors and abettors, such as Drs. Bacon and Adams.

They can see the hypocrisy and treachery of the political compromises, and denounce them as conceived and brought

forth by minds hostile to the principles of freedom and the Constitution, while they seem to perceive no enmity to Christianity and the Bible, by a sacrilegious shuffling of the theological cards to "sanction and sanctify" slaveholding Christianity, and "play the game to suit the infidels." And after darkening counsel by words without knowledge, handling the Word of God deceitfully, speaking in an unknown tongue—unknown to the great body of laymen—in the use of such phrases as *malum in se, sin per se, &c.*, ringing mystical changes upon them, designed and adapted to bewilder and mislead the unsuspecting, confiding Christian into a belief that, by some mysterious arrangement of the Divine economy, these cloaks which the great religious organs have manufactured to hide the iniquity of slaveholders and screen guilty tyrants from salutary admonition and discipline; or, if necessary, exposure, condemnation, and disgrace, they exclaim, "these are garments which Christian charity must allow them to put on."

The religious organs weep over the pusillanimous treachery of time-serving political parasites, while the latter laugh and sneer at the shallow logic, and hypocritical cant of the conservative D. D's.

Many years ago, when the American Temperance Union proclaimed the doctrine of the "immorality of the traffic in ardent spirits," the ministry generally, responded Amen.† The churches were electrified by the introduction of this new moral element into their creed; a few rejected the test at first, but uniformly, wholesome discipline was speedily instituted. More recently, an effort has been made to obtain a declaration of the church that "the traffic in human beings is an immorality." But, alas! she is dumb. She has many christian sons and daughters engaged in this traffic, who will not relinquish it, and must therefore be excluded from the fold, if the doctrine is established. These Christian slaveholders, are the relatives of the most learned, influential clergymen of the North, holding the organs, and controlling the denominations—who at once went to work to screen these relatives and friends from the impending censure. The Churches were warned not to admit the doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of slavery, because it was promulgated by "the infidel, Garrison." Yet everybody familiar with Puritan Theology, knew it had been taught by Edwards, Hopkins, and many other eminent divines, till within the last half century. But the "organs" commenced to frame excuses—not in "simple English," which unclassical, plain, honest layman could understand, but from *uninterpreted dead languages*, mingled with Scriptures so perverted by their sophistries, that more than half the clergymen were only the more perplexed by the "definitions," and befogged by the "distinctions," until their perverted judgements and smothered consciences, assented to the doctrines of their wily leaders.

The following will show how the consciences of good men were shocked, when the compromise process commenced.

DEA. H., a man of the old Puritan stamp, said to his minister, who was a conservative pastor of a New England Congregational Church:

"Parson, Can you tell me what the editor of our religious paper is trying to prove, by his strange talk about *malum in se*, and *sin per se*? What is the meaning of these words?"

"They mean simply," replied the pastor, "that a thing is wrong, or sinful in itself."

"Well, then," further inquired the deacon, "am I to understand that Mr. C. wants to prove that slavery is *not* wrong and sinful?"

"I suppose, Bro. H.," answered the Rev. Mr. R., gravely, "that he would have us understand that the system of slavery is not *inherently* sinful, and that, therefore, we should fellowship Christian slaveholders."

"That's what I feared he was aiming at," said the deacon with indignant emphasis, and I shall tell him to stop preaching such damnable heresies, or stop my paper!"

"Oh, don't be too hasty brother," said his pastor cautiously, "let us wait and hear the whole matter discussed, and see what action the great ecclesiastical bodies will take upon it, and then—"

"I don't care what your great men say about it," interrupted Deacon H. quickly. "I know that slavery is one of the greatest sins in the world, and any other teaching is a doctrine of devils!"—"You know I used to sell rum, Parson," he added with a nervous tone, "but when the Command-

ment came, I quit the wicked business. If I hadn't, you would have turned me out of the church, and done right—turn out rum-sellers, and take in men-sellers, eh?"

"Why, Deacon, you're getting excited, don't run on so," rejoined Parson R. reprovingly. "You and I can't comprehend and understand all the circumstances which may justify Christians in holding slaves, and—"

"There; don't you talk to me any more in that strain," sternly interrupted the Deacon. "You say the traffic in intoxicating drinks, is an immorality, to be censured by the Church; but the traffic in slaves, is not.—Slavery then, it seems, has come to be baptized into the name of Christianity! I tell you, once for all, Parson R., that I have no fellowship with such doctrines as this—and I shall stop the paper."

"But your opinions are established and the paper won't injure you," responded Parson R., firmly.

"No, but it will *spoil my children*, and I shall order it discontinued," replied the Deacon, decidedly.—That Deacon has ever since been consistent, anti-slavery Christian, enjoying the confidence of all who know him.

But that minister, under the auspices of his conservative religious "organ," has, by his treachery to freedom, lost the confidence, at least, of his good Deacon. C. G. P.

*Our correspondent will have found the greater part of these, extracts in the "WAY-MARKS," &c. of Rev. Henry T. Cheever, in the Principia.

†We feel impelled to record some facts, in connection with this statement of our Correspondent. The incipient steps for forming the "American Temperance Union" were taken at the first National Temperance Convention, which was held at Philadelphia, in June, 1833. It was our privilege to attend it, as a delegate from this city. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, (before the division) was in session, a part of the same time, in the same city. A Resolution was introduced into the Temperance Convention affirming the "immorality of the traffic in ardent spirits." When this was known in the "General Assembly," the greater part of the ministers of that body, being or acting as delegates also to the Temperance Convention, came into our Hall to take a part in the discussion, and, for the most part, to oppose the Resolution, which was chiefly advocated by laymen, only a few ministers assisting them. For a time, the clerical influence and the apprehended clerical vote, seemed likely to overpower us. At that juncture, a *mechanic's apprentice* from this city, a delegate of "the N. Y. Apprentices' Temperance Society," A. R. Crain, a lad of about eighteen, lame, and of diminutive appearance, succeeded in getting the floor, and making a pithy speech, of about five minutes, in which he expressed his astonishment that venerable religious teachers should oppose such a Resolution. As he sat down, Rev. Robert J. Breckenridge, then of Baltimore, arose and said, "Mr. President, we live in wonderful times, in which mechanic's apprentices can teach Doctors of Divinity. Sir," said he, "I go with the apprentice." The question was then taken, and the Resolution was carried. But clerical opposition did not then cease. It was continued for years, and with almost precisely the same tactics now as then employed on the Slavery question. As late as 1844, if we mistake not, Edward C. Delane declared in print, over his signature, that in the battle against the traffic, the influence of leading clergymen, some of whom he named, constituted the chief obstacle he had to encounter. Our correspondent's statement, therefore, except in respect to some particular localities, must be referred to more recent dates. We are compelled to say, that we have never encountered more clerical opposition to radical abolition than we have to radical temperance measures.—Editor of the Principia.

A BROTHER IN PRISON.

We are permitted to publish the following letter from a worthy Christian brother in prison, addressed to brother Newton, Editor of the "Golden Rule."

IN PRISON, GREENSBORO', N. C., Feb. 29, 1860.

DEAR BRO. NEWTON:—You are a man I never saw, and yet we are familiarly acquainted; to whom I never spoke, and yet I have conversed with you for hours; separated by leagues of intervening land and waters, yet present together, two separately and distinctly organized bodies, and yet but one spirit or soul.

These may be paradoxical assertions to some, but not to you. How art thou my brother? "Is thine heart right as my heart is with thy heart? If it be, give me thine hand."

As to me, I am joyful amidst my tribulations, though "still grinding in the prison house." O, how rich and precious are the promises of God! How abounding! I feel two where I used to see but one. And how adapted to my case, my poverty, my necessity! My soul is deeply humbled within me. O what a stoop of mercy was that which descended from heaven, to "pluck such a brand from the burning."

Long my imprisoned spirit lay,
Fast bound in sin and Nature's night,
Thine eye diffused a quickening ray,
I woke, the dungeon flamed with light!

I have often sung, but never till now with such a blessed experience.

"And prisons would palaces prove,
If Jesus would dwell with me there."

Is not the fullness of this blessing an answer to the many ten thousand prayers constantly going up to God in my behalf? Let them continue to ascend. Formerly, "Peter was kept in prison; but prayer was made without ceasing, of the Church unto God, for him." So let it be in the case of your unworthy brother. God will send down his angel. In the meantime, let epistles of charity brimful of love and consolation be showered upon me from all the dear brethren and sisters, in every quarter. Some have already come to hand; among them yours, dear brother, which was most acceptable. Some of these writers are called Quakers, Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Wesleyans; but I care little for these names. All I want to know is, are they grafted into the living vine?

Will you tell the dear brother who ministers in the Church of the Puritans, that I would like to have an epistle from him. If I rightly recollect, he was once cast into prison for "standing up for Jesus," and saying, "Wo to him that putteth the bottle to his neighbor's lips." Farewell, dear brother, we are soon to meet. Your brother in bonds,
D. WORTH.

I may be addressed at Greensboro', North Carolina, for a month to come.

RELIGION IN TUSCANY.

Progress of Protestantism—Distribution of the Bible—Effect of recent movements.

Correspondence of the N. Y. Times

ROME, Monday, Feb. 13, 1860.

The greatest difficulty in the way of the establishment of Italian liberty, is felt on all sides, to be the moral degeneracy of the Italian people. That they are not so weak and corrupt as they have been considered, the events of the last few months have proved; but it remains no less a fact, that the dominion of the Roman Church, has sapped the foundations of morality and virtue, on which alone the liberty of a nation can rest. It is therefore, a matter for rejoicing that, simultaneously with the delivery of so much of the Peninsula, from the temporal yoke of Austrian dynasties, the bonds of superstition are falling from the limbs of the community, rendering it more and more capable of preserving the liberty it seems about to win.

In view of this fact, it will be interesting to notice the new Protestant movement in Tuscany, the country of all others, where the rights of conscience seemed to be trodden under foot most completely, a few short months ago.

Under the late Grand Duke, the heresy of reading the Bible, or absenting one's self from Mass, was punished with great vigor. The case of the Madai family, which made all Europe vocal with indignation, is an illustration of the spirit of that Government. After that, the priests of Florence were shrewd enough to adopt a more moderate course. They shrank from stirring up the latent enmity of the Press of England and Germany, for a second time; and so their measures were rather cunning than violent. It is a proven fact, that they circulated infidel, atheistic, and scurrilous books, among the doubting members of their congregations, in order to keep them, at all events, from turning Protestants. Meanwhile, the country clergy were not so wise. Many a refractory *contadino* was sent to Florence for punishment by his offended pastor. Of course, such persons could not be suffered to return, to beard with impunity, the spiritual authority, and accordingly they were clapped into prison. But little stir was made about such cases—the friends of the cause, were too wise to weary Christendom with incessant complaint—as one of them said to me, "We thought it much better to wait till a number were imprisoned at one time, and then raise a storm of indignation." Lord Normandy (let us gladly say what we can, in praise of one, who is making himself ridiculous enough, in his old age, to obscure the memory of his former benevolence and generosity,) often got the poor fellows out of prison, by his own personal influence with the Grand Duke, so that their sufferings never reached so far as martyrdom. The only Protestant churches in Tuscany, were those of the

foreign residents in Florence, who were allowed, as a special favor, to meet in small rooms, fitted up as chapels. Spies were always stationed at the doors of these places, to see that no Italians entered.

In spite of all these restrictions however, there were Protestants in Tuscany. Bibles were smuggled in, in small quantities, from time to time, and distributed by a system of secret colportage; converts were made, and meetings were frequently held, though without ministers, for mutual encouragement.

Some dingy house was generally chosen in one of those narrow, dark streets, which are so plenty in Florence. The same house was not taken twice in succession; and if suspicion were aroused, they never went there again. The meetings were held in one of the higher stories; and the members dropped in by ones and twos, taking from half to three quarters of an hour to assemble. Thirty or forty were the largest number ever together. There were neither singing nor preaching; but at every meeting, they partook of the Lord's Supper, and round His table, pledged themselves anew to His cause. Those who have attended the gatherings in "an upper room," say that it seemed as though the Apostolic times had indeed returned, and the Spirit of Pentecost were once more abroad among men.

In this way it came to pass that, at the time of the Grand Duke's flight, there were, in Tuscany, ten thousand Bible readers, (mostly in and about Florence,) and three hundred communicants, who had proved their sincerity through imprisonment and pecuniary loss, and who clung together with constancy, though they had never been assembled in one place at one time to look upon each other's faces, and to cement their brotherhood by the clasp of mutual hands.

The new Government of Tuscany is, of course, nominally Catholic, but its tendencies are as well towards religious as civil liberty. It has given the Bible-readers full opportunity to read, and even the avowed Protestants are no longer persecuted as before. But, on the other hand, its own position has been so precarious that it dared not go further. The power of the clergy, once united to that of the aristocracy, might be sufficient to raise the dreaded counter-revolution, and crush at once the budding hope of Italy. "Only wait," said the authoritier, "till we are firmly established, politically; if there is to be a Congress, we must go before it with a purely political question. We beg of you, therefore, *hasten slowly*. Do not cause us to regret the privileges we have granted you."

There are many ardent sympathizers in Europe and America, who wonder why the Protestants of Italy do not blaze out in a triumphant movement, and "do great things." The fact stated above may explain to such the real reason. Much has been gained, but not all!

Yet the change under the present Government is one of great importance. Bibles are publicly sold in Florence, and there is a regular depot now established, under the charge of a superintendent, whence colporters go out all over the country. These native colporters have canvassed the capital since the war with great thoroughness and boldness. They rung the door-bell of every respectable house, went into all the cafes, shows and markets, and sold great quantities of bibles and tracts. And now they are similarly at work in the country districts. Even at Pisa, under the very nose of the Archbishop, a little church is established by their efforts. The prelate complained, not long ago, to the Government, that "while he was celebrating mass in the Cathedral, a lot of shoemakers and peddlers should dare to be whining and praying within the very shadow of its walls." He received for answer a hint that if he couldn't keep his own flock in order, no one would undertake to do it for him.

Unfortunately, through the influence of some earnest and well-meaning, but injudicious people (English) in Florence, the converts there became imbued with *Plymouthism*. Disgusted as they were with priestcraft, they were ready enough to accept the doctrine that the Christian church needed no ordained ministry,—that every brother should use the "gifts" he had, or thought he had; and that no one should monopolize nor be exempt from the duty of spiritual instruction. Right or wrong, the immediate effects of this were undoubtedly unhappy. The new church refused to employ a minister, but had for a few weeks a very eloquent preacher from Leghorn, I believe. The room where they met was soon crowded; and after one or two meetings the square outside was also full. Here the Archbishop of Pisa again remonstrated, threatening to go to Rome, or leave Tuscany to its fate, if his wishes were not heeded. If the meetings had had a head, (as, for instance, the Scotch and

English churches, whose ministers are responsible for all that is said or done at the services,) the Government would have protected them still; but Riccasoli was himself afraid of an assemblage so enthusiastic and without control, where any voice had a right to be heard, and every voice spoke the most ultra truths. So the church was shut up, and the work received a check.

The Protestants have learnt somewhat from the circumstances, and are beginning to see the damage of going so fast and far. It is probable that they will choose a pastor soon; and the authorities will make no further objection to their public worship. Indeed, the Council stood ready, before, to give them the use of an old Catholic chapel, and grant them the utmost freedom consistent with the general order and safety. A young Waldensian minister has been called from Piedmont, who combines enthusiasm with discretion, and, (as far as my personal acquaintance enables me to judge,) seems eminently adapted to win and keep the hearts of the people. The Waldenses have come so recently from the furnace of persecution themselves, that they are peculiarly qualified for judicious and yet energetic missionary effort.

I have mentioned no names in the above narration. Prudence suggests that the time is not yet come for the fullest publicity, though there are those to whom the thanks of Christians are personally due for their untiring perseverance in this work, and who deserve as much as they deprecate some public recognition of their services.

The most important part of the movement—the distribution of books, and the establishment of schools, I reserve for another letter.
R. W. R.

THE DRED SCOTT DECISION IN THE NEW-YORK COURTS.

—There are few people in this city, who have not heard of Thomas Downing, the famous colored caterer to the public appetite, in oysters. Thomas has kept a stand in Broad street, near Wall, for many years past, and has accumulated quite a fortune. He has also gained a name, as well as money, by his business at some of the watering places. It was supposed by many people, that he must be immensely rich, but it seems that this is not the case, for on Saturday last, he was summoned to the Supreme Court, to be examined as a judgment debtor on proceedings supplementary to execution. It did not appear by what means he was reduced to this state. He objected to being sworn, and an application was made to Judge Sutherland, to settle the question. Downing informed the Judge that he refused to take the oath, because, by the Dred Scott decision, he was deprived of all the rights of a citizen, and was held to be a mere chattel. The point was a forcible one for the Judge, who, after moment's consideration, decided that for the present purpose, he might be considered a human being, and a citizen. The proceedings caused some merriment in the Court Room.—*Tribune*.

This decision assumes that the Dred Scott decision was illegal. But, would Judge Sutherland have decided thus, in a case where the interests and rights of a colored man would have been protected by the decision? This case strongly illustrates the diabolism of American jurisprudence in respect to the colored people.

BRATTLEBORO' BANK, VERMONT.—Counterfeit \$3 bills, purporting to be of this bank, are in circulation. Three men were brought before Justice Whitley of Hoboken, charged with passing them. The parties, after an examination, were ordered to make the counterfeit bills good, and to pay the costs. They were laboring men, and it did not appear to the Judge, that they were in the practice of passing counterfeit bills.

A NEW SLAVE STATE.—Movements are on foot to make a new Slave State, out of Northern Mississippi, Western Tennessee, and the extreme Western part of Kentucky, so as to get two more slaveholding senators in Congress. The Tennessee Legislature has approved it. So says *The Tribune*, but it does not say—for it cannot—that the election of a Republican administration, with a working majority of both Houses of Congress, would interpose the least obstacle to the admission of the new slave State. The party platform of 1856, did not contain that plank, and its leaders are constantly disclaiming it.

DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION.—It is proposed to change the place of holding the Democratic National Nominating Convention, from Charleston to Baltimore, because Charleston could not accommodate the large numbers that would be in attendance.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1860.

SHORT METHOD WITH SLAVERY APOLOGISTS.

Those who weary themselves to imagine and exhibit cases of innocent slaveholding, are in the habit of supposing cases that can rarely, if ever, occur, or which, when sifted to the bottom, are found to be no cases of slaveholding at all, but only of redemption and enfranchisement. If they can succeed in confusing an opponent, or of drawing from him a concession of the innocence of any particular person whose case they have thus presented, they become at once, exultant, and applying the exception to the general fact, proclaim boastfully, that the innocence of slaveholding has been successfully demonstrated.

The same ingenuity might be as honestly employed, and with equal success, in proving that robbery and theft, the forcible or secret taking of property, without the owner's consent, in certain peculiar cases, may be innocent, and then, on the strength of a concession, in this particular case, proclaiming that robbery and theft are not *sin per se*, inherently sinful.

One simple dilemma may dispose of all these ingeniously contrived cases. Unless they are exceptions to the general facts or conditions of slaveholding, they cannot be innocent. If they are exceptions, then the exception only confirms instead of invalidating the rule.

Or, thus. The case described either does constitute a case of slaveholding, or it does not. If it does, then it constitutes a case of man-stealing, and is sinful. If it does not, then it proves nothing concerning the innocence of slaveholding.

Or thus, again. If the case be found to be a case of man-stealing, then, if the Bible, be true, it is, of course, sinful. But if it be not a case of man-stealing, then it is not a case of slaveholding, (for the terms are convertible) and affords no evidence against the sinfulness of slaveholding.

Presidential Candidates and their Supporters.

The three names most prominent before the nation, at the present time, for prospective nomination for the Presidency, are Douglas, Seward and Bates, the Republicans dividing their attention chiefly, between the two latter. It is natural to inquire into the position of these candidates in respect to the great questions arising out of the existence of slavery.

OF MR. SEWARD it is doubtless believed that he is the most strongly Anti-slavery of any of the persons in his party who have been talked of, as candidates. His especial friends would claim this for him. His opponents charge it as an objection against him. Let us see then what sort of an Anti-Slavery man Mr. Seward is.

Says the *New York Times*:

"MR. EVERETT has been for twenty years held up to odium by the Anti-Slavery journals, for having declared in Congress, that he would shoulder his musket to aid in putting down a slave insurrection in any Southern State. This was considered the *ne plus ultra* of devotion to the Constitutional rights of the South. But Mr. Seward avowed precisely the same sentiment, only in different language, when he said to the Slave States, represented in the Senate, 'if your sovereignty shall be assailed, no matter what the pretext, or who the foe, we shall defend it, as the equivalent of our own.' Not even the sharpest and most bitter of his opponents has been able to find anything in this speech to support the current charge of radicalism or sectionalism against him, except perhaps his distinction between the South and North as Capital States and Labor States respectively.—and yet this distinction, so far from being original with Mr. Seward, is simply adopted from Mr. Webster's Plymouth oration delivered as long ago as in 1820,—when Mr. W., speaking of the West Indies and other Slave States, says:—

"The agriculture of these regions is a sort of commerce, and it is a species of employment in which labor seems to form an inconsiderable ingredient in the productive classes—since the portion white labor is exceedingly small, and slave labor is rather more like profit on stock or capital than labor properly so called."

It amounts then, to this. MR. SEWARD, with MR. EVERETT, pledges himself and the country, if he is made President, to engage in a civil war, in respect to which Mr. Jefferson said: "The Almighty has no attributes which could take sides with us." Who will join with Mr. Seward, in this, by voting for him?

OF MR. BATES of Missouri, the people of the non-slavehold-

ing States have had less knowledge. *The St. Louis Evening News* of Nov. 8th, defines his position for him, with much confidence. It represents him as being opposed to the extension of Slavery into Territories already free—holds that slavery is not protected by the Constitution, but only by local law. The rejoices that Missouri is becoming a free-State, and would have the Federal Government provide a Territory for colonizing free blacks. But—(we quote from the *News*.)

"Mr. Bates believes in the unqualified right of the owner to recover his slaves if they escape to a Free State; and, if President, he would execute the Fugitive Slave law, if the army and navy of the Government were equal to the task. And if the Fugitive Slave Law should be repealed, or should be found inadequate to the service of returning absconding slaves to their masters, Mr. Bates would earnestly recommend to Congress to pass some law that would more certainly and more acceptably, carry out the constitutional guarantees of the rights of Southern slaveholders. He would consider the Union a broken compact, if these plain guarantees were denied by the deliberate and persisting action of any part of the Confederacy."

"If Congress, clearly representing the will of the country, should pass laws legalizing and protecting slave property in Territories previously free, Mr. Bates would execute those laws as promptly as any other laws of the land. If a Territory should organize into a State, with a sufficient population to justify its admission, and present a Constitution tolerating Slavery, Mr. Bates would not oppose the admission of such State because it had a Pro-Slavery Constitution."

Of these statements of views, the *New York Tribune* (Nov. 14,) says.

"The views respecting Slavery of Edward Bates of Missouri, as authoritatively set forth by *The St. Louis Evening News*—will inevitably be studied and pondered by every intelligent and reflecting American. While they do not in all respects accord with our convictions, we hail them as embodying the soundest, the clearest, the most forcible expressions yet put forth of the genuine Conservative sentiment of our country. Mr. Bates in politics belongs to the school of Henry Clay, of whom he was, while in public life thirty odd years ago, and has remained ever since, an ardent admirer and disciple."

The N. Y. Independent indicates its preference for Seward, but says:

"Judge Bates has been commended in some quarters with an unwise activity and pertinacity, while in other quarters the proposal of his name has been rejected and denounced for reasons which seems to savor more of party-spirit and party-policy than of simple patriotism. We do not at all believe that Judge Bates will receive the nomination at Chicago for the office of President; nor do we, on the whole, desire that he should be thus nominated. We are, therefore, the more free to say that we know him personally, as well as by his public reputation; and that there is no better man than he—none to whose religious fidelity, and far-sighted patriotism, and manly independence of spirit, the great trust of the Presidency could be more safely committed."

Did the *Independent* say this, while apprized of the position of Mr. Bates on the enforcement of the rendition of fugitive slaves? Would its editor advise christians to vote for such a candidate on the principle taking up with "the best government you can get?" How long would it take for them to "get" a good government, on this plan.

DR. CHEEVER'S NEW WORK.

We are happy to announce the appearance of this long expected work, of which we gave notice, some time since, viz. "*The Guilt of Slavery, and the Crime of slaveholding, demonstrated from the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures.*" By GEORGE B. CHEEVER, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Puritans, &c., &c. Boston, John P. Jewett & Company, 20 Washington Street, 1860, pp. 472.

"The argument which we propose to develop," says the author, in his introduction, "demonstrating the iniquity of slavery, is four-fold: philological, statutory, or legal, historical and moral. The argument, from consequences, is, both historical and moral."

In his "CHAPTER II," on "The varieties of the demonstration against slavery," &c., the author enumerates no less than twenty-two different forms of argument, each of which he briefly illustrates. The volume is divided into forty-two chapters, embracing as many distinct topics.

In examining the passages of Scriptures bearing on slavery, including those, especially, that have been claimed as in its favor, Dr. Cheever has resorted directly to the original Greek and Hebrew, exposing, most thoroughly, by the meaning of the words, as elsewhere employed, and in the light of known facts and usages, the gross blunders of lexographers, translators, and commentators, by means of which, the true meaning of the inspired writers, has been manifest-

ly perverted for the support of slavery. In this laborious part of his work, he has probably surpassed all his predecessors, and we trust, he has forever settled the question, if there could be any question plausibly raised, whether a Book with the known and acknowledged principles of the Bible, could have given its sanction, in particular passages, to a system of practices and usages, the most intensely opposite to those principles, that could be conceived, thus counteracting, in its details, the grand and avowed ends for which the volume was designed. But we need more time to study Dr. Cheever's book, and more time and room to write in, than we can now command, before we can do justice to a work of so much research and importance. We heartily commend it to our readers.

SEWARD'S TWO SPEECHES—THE LAWS OF PERSPECTIVE.

We are pleased to notice that the *Liberator* and the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* are reviewing the late speech of Mr. Seward in befitting terms. From some causes, those journals and Wendell Phillips have been wont to read the utterances of Mr. Seward with other eyes than we have been able to do. But, in the present instance, we find them at one with us.

From the *Liberator*, March 9th.

"This speech greatly disappoints us; not on the score of rhetorical skill, or power of condensation, or clearness of statement, or historical accuracy, for it is a very creditable performance in these particulars; but because it evinces, throughout, the adroit, calculating, heartless politician, rather than the wise, courageous, far-seeing statesman. It has no pulsations of life, no throbbings of humanity; it is wholly destitute of moral feeling and purpose. Instead of reasserting the doctrine of an 'irrepressible conflict' between Freedom and Slavery, it is a laborious attempt to show that there need be no collision—certainly no unfriendly collision—between these forces, and that there is no reason why they may not remain in juxtaposition without heat or jealousy, *ad infinitum*!"

From the *Standard*.

"His speech is as nearly non-committal as speeches from the throne usually are; but there is still committal enough to give occasion to the assaults of his enemies and to the cooling of his friends. We think that the effect of this speech will be twofold. First, that it will secure him the Chicago nomination, and, secondly, that it will procure his defeat at the polls. Our ground for this latter belief is that it is an effectual damper to the anti-slavery enthusiasm of the North, and that no Republican President can be elected that does not kindle that warmth. This Mr. Seward has done in a marked degree, ever since his Rochester speech, and the contagion seemed to spread the more as it was encountered with lies and calumnies. This speech will do much to quench that growing zeal. Multitudes, we believe, of the plain voters will say to themselves on reading it, 'Wherein doth this man differ from Douglas? Both admit slavery into the Territories if the inhabitants choose to have it there, and neither objects to the admission of slave States, and much less proposes to repeal any of the villainies that have been organized into slave-hunting laws. Is it worth while to leave our harvests and our herds to elect between such rulers? Could Douglas speak of the colored race with a keener contempt, or with a more heartless acquiescence in the doom Slavery dealt to glorious Old Brown, than has the candidate the Republicans offer us? Let the potsherd of party strive with their like; it matters not which dashes the other in pieces.'"

"These very qualities, however, are the ones which will commend Mr. Seward to the leaders of the party, who will shape the nomination. Their error, we think, lies in taking it for granted that they are sure of the anti-slavery voters of the North, and that all they can secure of the pro-slavery ones, by coming as near to their level as they can, will be so much gained. They are more likely to lose the first, without gaining the last."

We think the *Standard*, the *Liberator*, and Wendell Phillips erred in supposing that Mr. Seward's "irrepressible conflict" speech at Rochester meant any thing more than to draw off votes from Gerrit Smith, sufficient to secure, as it did, the election of E. D. Morgan, at a time when the principal journals of the party did not expect it. Abolitionists, generally, failed to scrutinize that speech as closely as they should have done. Had they searched, they would have discovered in it an explanation sufficiently ample to cover the whole ground of his recent speech in the Senate. We noticed it, at the time, and just as soon as the election was over, and the desired object secured, the *Tribune* noticed it likewise, and has been ever since parading it.

Speeches of politicians should be studied as we would study a picture—that is, we should notice what use the artist has made of the laws of perspective. A landscape

In this laborious
ed all his predi-
ed the question,
aised, whether a
principles of the
rticular passage,
most intensely ex-
ceived, thus con-
red ends for which
ore time to study
om to write in
do justice to a
ce. We heartily

LAWS OF PER-

ator and the Ne-
g the late speech
ome causes, those
wont to read the
es than we have
nce, we find them

ator, March 9th.

ot on the score of
e, or clearness of
a very creditable
cause it evinces
rtless politician,
g statesman. It
humanity; it is
ose. Instead of
ible conflict" be-
rious attempt to
ly no unfriendly
here is no reason
without heat or

om the Standard.

as speeches from
ommittal enough
emies and to the
he effect of this
secure him the
will procure his
ter belief is that
ry enthusiasm of
at can be elected
Mr. Seward has
ochester speech,
ore as it was en-
speech will do
ides, we believe,
on reading it,
us? Both admit
s choose to have
of slave States,
the villanies that
ws. Is it worth
to elect between
colored race with
acquiescence in
own, than has the
he potsherds of
which dashes the

ones which will
party, who will
k, lies in taking
i-slavery voters
the pro-slavery
they can, will be
to lose the first,

I Wendell Phil-

"irrepressible
ng more than to
to secure, as it
when the princi-
Abolitionists,
as closely as
ed, they would
iently ample to
h in the Senate.
as the election
Tribune noticed
it.

d as we would
what use the
A. Landgrave

may be drawn with an unwelcome object, far off in the back ground, where it is little noticed, makes little or no impression, and is mellowed by the distance, while an elegant edifice occupies the fore-ground. The same artist, to gratify other tastes, may paint the same landscape, including the same objects, from a different stand-point, bringing into the fore-ground the object that was before seen in the distance, and sinking into the distance what was before in the fore-ground. So of the two speeches of Mr. Seward; the first of which brought the "irrepressible conflict" into the fore-ground, to please the abolitionists, while the explanation that neutralized it was so brief and distant that it was scarcely discovered; while the latter speech brings the disclaimer into the fore-ground, where it belittles if it does not absolutely eclipse "the irrepressible conflict." The two speeches contain the same ideas, pro and con—the only difference being in the perspective. We saw nothing in the first that we did not in the last; we see nothing in the last that we did not see in the first. But the first picture was taken from the stand-point of Rochester—the second from Washington city. The people should learn the laws of perspective, and apply them to the speeches of politicians. Put Mr. Seward at Rochester again, with the same surroundings, and you will have the same picture.

News of the Day.

WAR WITH MEXICO.

Are the United States at war with Mexico? So it would seem. Time was, when the question of peace or war, with a foreign nation, had to be submitted to both Houses of Congress, and discussed and voted upon by the Representatives of the people, and the Senators from the several States. That time has gone by. The Seminole war, and the late war with Mexico, have practically annulled that part of the Constitution, which says: "Congress shall have power to declare war." Congress is in Session, but the President issues his orders to his military and naval officers, without consulting them. The news that the Government of their country is at war with a neighboring Republic, comes to them, with their morning breakfast, or evening supper, as unexpectedly as it does to their constituents. Talk of monarchy! Talk of consolidation! The President is absolute—nay, rather, he is the tool of the slavery oligarchy, whose rule is a necessity, inseparable from the existence of slavery in the States, which, even the opposition party pledges itself not to molest.

From *The N. Y. Times*;

"We have important news from Mexico. The details of the news by the *Star of the West*, are at hand. By telegraph from New-Orleans, we learn that the Mexican war steamers, *General Miramon* and *Marquez*, are at that port, in charge of Lieutenants Minor and Chapman, of the *Saratoga*. Both were captured off Anton Lizardo, on the morning of the 6th inst., after a brief action, and with only a slight loss, and are prizes to the United States. The *Marquez* has on board a portion of the prisoners taken, and the U. S. ship *Preble* was to bring the remainder. *Miramón*, on the 29th ult., with 5,000 men, a numerous train of artillery, and plentiful stores of ammunition, encamped within four miles of Vera Cruz, and laid siege to the city. The garrison, composed of between 3,000 and 4,000 men, was commanded by General Iglesias. Col. Vivaldo, who was in command of one of the principal forts on the Southern side, was detected in conspiracy to blow up the fort on *Miramón's* approach, and was condemned to four years' imprisonment. Thirty conspirators were banished from the city. The *Saratoga*, *Saratoga*, and *Preble* were anchored under the walls of San Juan d'Ulloa, and English, Spanish, and French vessels were at Sacrificios. Capt. Turner of the *Saratoga*, visited *Miramón's* camp, in behalf of the American citizens. On the night of the 5th inst., *Miramón* made an attack upon the city in force, but was repulsed by the Liberals. The latter were confident of their ability to withstand every assault. Alvarado is reported to be in the possession of *Miramón*. The *Exequator* of the American Counsel at Vera Cruz, has been revoked. The action of the American squadron had created great excitement at Vera Cruz.

The *Herald* and *The Tribune* announced the news without comment. *The Times* editorial, has the following:

"The telegraph, this morning, seems to assure us, that the American Government has interfered with the strong hand, in behalf of liberal principles in Mexico."

The *Utica Herald* of the 17th, says, "We saw Gerrit Smith in town yesterday, and were glad to observe that he is looking unusually well and hearty. We should judge that he had entirely recovered from his late affliction."

CONGRESS.

WASHINGTON, March 18th.

THE TARIFF.—The new Tariff bill will be reported to the House to-morrow, under the revised rules.

March 20th.

Mr. Sumner presented to the Senate a memorial signed by four hundred citizens of Boston, asking for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law of 1850, the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, and the passage of a resolution pledging Congress against the acquisition of any more Slave Territory. On motion of Mr. Davis the petition was laid on the table, by a vote of 30 to 17. Various measures were proposed by Mr. Wilson for more effectual suppression of the African Slave-trade. He introduced a bill authorizing the construction of five steamships for the special purpose of cruising on the African coast; a joint resolution instructing the President to negotiate with other nations for the right of search within two hundred miles of the Western coast of Africa, and an order directing the Judiciary Committee to report a bill making imprisonment for life the penalty for engaging in the African Slave-trade, and extending this punishment to the owners of slave ships.

A remarkable change has taken place within the last forty-eight hours in the minds of those legislators who have opposed the Nicaragua and Mexican Treaties. The Democratic Senators held a caucus this morning to discuss the propriety of ceasing all effort to make any treaty with any Spanish-American country, since the Republicans have brought matters to a dead lock. The Republican Senators also held a caucus on the same subject, and the discussion was warm. The result was that Senator Dixon, of Connecticut, and several others, joined Senator Wilson in the policy indicated by his vote on the Nicaragua Treaty, and it is said that sufficient Republicans will unite with the Democrats to carry the Mexican Treaty, and, if practicable, resuscitate the Nicaragua Treaty, and pass it. There are indications of an entire change in the Republican Platform. The speech of Mr. Cox in the House, on Mexico, is regarded as a superb exposition of the subject by those who understand it. The trouble is that there are not many in Congress who know enough about Mexico to appreciate an effort like that of Mr. Cox.

The above is from a correspondent of the *N. Y. Times*, the Editor of which says:

"We are not surprised to hear that the incident has made a sensation at Washington. Whatever other effect it may produce, it can scarcely fail to satisfy the Republican Senators that it is by no means safe merely to thwart the Government, in its attempts to place our relations with the Spanish American States upon a fixed and satisfactory basis. They are in so critical a condition that mere inactivity will not answer. Something must be done. We must either have peace, upon terms regulated by treaties, or we shall drift into war.

Senator Wilson is entitled to great credit for the sagacity and the independence of his action upon these questions; and we are not surprised to hear that some of his Republican colleagues are inclined to retrace their steps, and endeavor to avert the new issues and fresh perils which seem about to come upon the country. We hope they may succeed."

[In other words, the Republicans must needs vie with the Democrats, in sustaining the administration in its filibustering attacks upon Mexico, lest they should lose votes in the Presidential Election. But will this help them?—*Ed. Principia.*]

THE Washington Correspondent of *The Boston Traveler*, in his last letter, alludes as follows to the case of Mr. Hyatt:

"Mr. Mason's resolutions were passed by a vote of 44 to 10; and, singular as it may appear, Toombs was found voting with Sumner, Wade, and Wilson. Mr. Hyatt was then conducted to jail, and placed in close custody; and though suffering from the combined effects of illness and the nervous excitement consequent upon his position, was debarred the visits of his friends. Last night Judge Conway was refused admittance to his cell, as was also Judge Army, who is present as his next of kin. Efforts are, however, being made this morning to procure for Mr. Hyatt such privileges at least as are allowed to the worst of criminals, but which have been so far refused to him."

NEW YORK LEGISLATURE.

ALBANY, March 17.

FREE SUFFRAGE.

The resolution to submit to the people a proposition for an amendment to the Constitution, so as to abolish the qualification for colored voters, was taken up and passed by the following vote:

YEAS—Messrs. Abell, Bell, Ferry, Goss, Hammond, Lapham, McGraw, Manierre, Montgomery, Munroe, Prosser, Ramsey, Richmond, Sessions, Truman, Warner, Williams—17.

NAYS—Messrs. Blood, Connolly, Fiero, Gardiner, Grant, Kelly, Lawrence, Robertson, Spinola—9.

The resolution passed the Assembly some time ago.

RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

The act for the Protection of the Property Rights of Married Women, which has passed both branches of our Legislature, and now lacks only the approval of the Governor to become a law, is the most comprehensive and thorough measure of the kind ever passed by a legislative body. We do not see that, though less would have been inadequate, more could reasonably be desired, so far as property is concerned. That act will enable five thousand women in our State to earn and save, and live on their own resources, who are now living on sufferance, and whose furniture, and even clothing, in the case of each, belongs to a reprobate or drunkard who first deceived, then deserted her, leaving her to toil in penury for a bare subsistence, liable at any moment to be stripped of her all, by the brute who has made her life wretched. We wish the act had said expressly that a widowed mother shall not be deprived of her children by her husband's will, but shall be their guardian whenever the proper authority does not appoint another; but the act is so good that we can hardly speak of this as a fault. Let us rejoice that, in spite of all discouraging appearances, the world does move.—*Tribune.*

Final of the Harper's Ferry Affair.

EXECUTION OF STEVENS AND HAZLETT.

CHARLESTOWN, Va., Friday, March 16, 1860.

The town was thronged with visitors to-day, and several companies of military were in attendance. Stevens and Hazlett were hung at noon. They appear resigned to their fate. Stevens died very hard, while Hazlett died without a struggle. Both exhibited great firmness and resignation.

There were no religious exercises at the gallows, as the prisoners persisted in refusing all the kindly offices of the ministry in their last moments. Both of their bodies have been forwarded to Marcus Spring, South Amboy, N. J. They will reach Baltimore in the early morning train.—*Tribune.*

The remains of Stevens and Hazlett were brought to Eaglewood, N. J. for interment. The execution took place on Friday. The remains were forwarded by express, and reached Rahway on Saturday, when they were taken at once to Eaglewood. The coffins were opened, but the bodies were not submitted to the care of an undertaker. The features were scarcely recognizable, and they were not shown either to the intimate friends of the deceased or at the funeral. Attached to the button-hole of Stevens' coat by red and blue ribbons was a plain black India-rubber ring, but for whom it was intended his friends were not informed. His betrothed accompanied his remains from Charlestown, and was joined at Eaglewood by his father and sister.—*Id.*

From the *Charlestown Jeffersonian*.

The near approach of the day of execution seemed to have but little effect on the prisoners, and for the past few days they were unusually cheerful, Stevens declaring it was his wish to be free, and therefore desired the day for his execution to arrive. Mrs. Pearce, the sister of Stevens, was with him up to yesterday morning, and made a fine impression on all with whom she was thrown, by her lady-like deportment and conduct. On Thursday a Miss Dunbar, of Ohio, arrived in town. It is said she was engaged to be married to Stevens at the time of the Harper's Ferry invasion, and has corresponded with him since his imprisonment in this town. She is a lady of much intelligence and beauty.

A brother of Hazlett, who resides at Armstrong County, Pa. also arrived a few days ago, and was present with his brother until yesterday morning. He advised Hazlett to make a full confession of his connection with the Brown party, and counselled him to abandon all hope of a reprieve or commutation of punishment.

Yesterday morning the table was set in the passage for the criminals to eat, and seated around were the two men, who in a few hours were to be launched into eternity, a sister, and the betrothed of one, and the brother of the other. A solemn feast, and one which was seemingly enjoyed by but two—the condemned.

After the breakfast had been partaken of, the friends of the criminals bade them a long farewell and took a carriage for Harper's Ferry, where they remained until the bodies of the executed reached that place.

At eleven o'clock the field on which the scaffold was erected was occupied by a large number of spectators, a still larger number, however, remaining in town to accompany the sad procession. Col. John T. Gibson was in command of the military, which made a magnificent display. The following companies were posted around the scaffold before the arrival of the prisoners: Clarke Guards, Capt. Bowen; Berkeley Border Guards, Capt. Nadenbousch; Floyd Guards, Capt. G. W. Chambers; Floyd Riflemen, Capt. T. S. Duke; Armory Guard, Capt. Derrick; Letcher Cadets, Capt. Campbell; Continental Morgan guards, Capt. Haines, and Letcher Riflemen, Lieut. Link.

At 10 minutes to 12 o'clock the prisoners made their appearance on the field, escorted by the Hamtramck Guards, Capt. Butler, Jefferson Guards, Capt. Rowan, and Botts' Greys, Capt. Lawson Botts. The prisoners walked to the scaffold. Hazlett was in advance, and ascended the steps with an easy, unconcerned air, followed by Stevens. Both seemed to survey with perfect difference the large mass of persons in attendance, and neither gave the least sign of fear. A short time was spent in adjusting the ropes properly around the necks of the prisoners, which was improved by them in taking an affectionate farewell of the Sheriff, jailor and jail guard, after which the caps were placed over their heads, and Aaron D. Stevens and Albert Hazlett were launched into eternity, to be dealt with by a Judge "who doeth all things right."

There was no religious exercise with the prisoners, as they declined all efforts from the clergy.

Just before the caps were drawn over their heads, Stevens and Hazlett embraced each other and kissed.

The fall broke the neck of Hazlett, and he died without a struggle, while the knot slipped on Stevens' neck, and he writhed in contortions for several minutes. They were permitted to hang about half an hour, when they were examined and pronounced dead.

The bodies were placed in neat walnut coffins, and forwarded to Mr. Marcus Spring, South Amboy, N. J. It is understood Mr. Spring sent money here for the purpose of paying a portion of the funeral expenses.

From the N. Y. Herald.

THE FUNERAL SERVICES.

The funeral services were performed in the parlors of Mr. Spring's dwelling, the rooms were completely filled—about one hundred and fifty persons, many of whom were young boys and girls, being present. The bodies were not brought into the room, but were placed in the hearses at the beginning of the ceremonies.

The Rev. Dr. Arms, of Norwich, Conn., opened the services by reading the hymn entitled "Come unto me and I will give you rest," which was beautifully sung, with the sweet accompaniment of a well played piano.

After the singing of the hymn, the reverend doctor read a collection of passages of Scripture, concluding with the account of the burial of Christ and the closing of the sepulchre. At the conclusion of the reading,

Dr. Arms said:—My friends, it seems a dreadful thing to face the dread realities of the tomb; to give up life and all its blessings, enjoyments and advantages, all its bright hopes and dreams of ambition, to descend into the dark valley of the shadow of death. Especially is this the case with the young. It does not seem so hard a thing for the old to die; nor does it so draw out our sympathies. The old die in the fulness of their time, as the ripened corn is gathered in at the harvest, with all their designs accomplished, all their plans carried out, all their purposes achieved. But with the young the case is far different. They leave the enjoyment of the present; they relinquish all those happier hours which seem to await them in the future. Beloved friends, fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers, and those nearer and dearer than any of these are left, and so are all the honors, pursuits and pleasures of this world. It seems very hard for the young to die. But then, my friends, it is better to die than do worse—to give up principle, to relinquish honor, to do wrong. You doubtless remember when the steamer Arctic was lost upon our northern coast, amid all the confusion of such an occasion, when hardy sailors and men, called brave, were running hither and thither, distracted at their imminent peril, a lad stood alone at his gun, firing at regular intervals as a signal of distress, and to induce some passing vessel to come to their assistance. A thick fog was upon the water, like the mist which enveloped us this morning, and through it came the quick flashes and the sullen booming of this signal gun. The noble ship went down, and with her this brave lad; and when the boy's father was informed of his loss, and of the circumstance to which I have alluded, he said that he was comforted, that it was far better for his son to die thus than to mingle his fears with those of the distracted crew. You remember, also, that Bishop Cranmer was induced, by the dread of suffering, to sign a recantation of his faith; but upon a reconsideration of the value of life here and of life eternal, he retracted his recantation, and gave his body to be burned. And, it is said that when led to the burning pile, he thrust his right hand into the flames, exclaiming, "That hand! that guilty hand!" which had signed the disavowal of his principles. It is better to die as friends than to do wrong

In the execution of these men, whose funeral we are here to attend, stern justice has exacted the very utmost penalty—death. I cannot blame the court or the law which condemned them; I suppose that the law must be acquitted from all blame; neither can I in all respects commend the example of the deceased to the young men whom I see around me. When Cuba was invaded, the ringleader of the filibusters was executed, but, at the same time, his followers were pardoned and sent back to this country. This was the mercy of despotic Spain; but Virginia has demanded and taken the very last drop of blood within her reach. But I am told that Stevens was guiltless of any design to shed blood, and that, in all respects, he was a most kind-hearted, humane and Christian man. I do not know how he became involved in the affair which ended in his execution. But in his love of the oppressed, even to his laying down of his life for them, and in all those qualities which go to make up true manhood, I can commend him to the young as an example. At a subsequent period the Rev. Dr. remarked that his acquaintance with Stevens terminated with his boyhood, and that then he was always known to side with the weak against the strong. He concluded by asking the sympathy of all present in behalf of the father, sister, betrothed bride and the friends of Stevens, in their sorrow and bereavement.

After the singing of the hymn, "Nearer to Thee, O God,"

Mr. Theo. TILTON, of the Independent, rose and said, in substance, that it was not the speeches, but the hour itself which evoked their sympathies, and by the glistening eyes and moistened cheeks of all present, he could see that sympathy was not wanting. He connected this occasion with the burial of that old patriarch—John Brown. Upon his grave, among the Northern mountains, the snows were yet lying. He could acquit neither the law nor the court which condemned these men. Stevens was shot while bearing a flag of truce, through which no bullet was sharp enough to cut except in Virginia, once the mother of Presidents, but now the mother of slaves. When the design of the "invasion" of Virginia was fully known, it would be found to contain nothing of which all good men might not approve. It was a design merely to run off a number of slaves by means of a bloodless insurrection, as Brown had done in Missouri. Remembering that he was within sight of the fields sanctified by our Revolutionary conflict, he could not but say that a nation enslaved had a right to free itself by arms, if necessary. The children and grandchildren of the Bohemians who rose against Austria were compelled to wear the blood-red badge of their ancestor's crime, but in three centuries Bohemia was free and the badge became one of honor. So, although men might deride the descendants of the men of Harper's Ferry, yet in three centuries they would be proud of their fathers, who would then be the admiration of the world. Man was impatient. He had often wondered how God could be so very patient, so "slow," as a canonized saint expressed it, and yet he could wait God's time; but he believed that when opportunity was put near one's hand it was his duty to grasp it, even though he should use the sword, the musket, and the pike. He again defended Stevens from the charge of murder, saying that until Stevens was shot no man of the attacking party, according to his own testimony given in view of death, had been harmed except by his own friends by mistake. He concluded by holding up the ring found upon Stevens' breast, saying that it was doubtless intended for his unwedded wife, cruelly made a widow, and invoking the sympathies and the tears of those present in behalf of Stevens' friends.

Mrs. SPRING then read extracts from Stevens' letters, written from the Charlestown jail, and also Hazlett's letter of thanks that his body was not to lie in a "land of chains." Both of the men asserted that they were happy to die for freedom. Mrs. S. then read Stevens' favorite song, the well known "Faded Flowers," saying that it showed how tender-hearted and kind he was. Mrs. Spring is a pleasant looking, elderly lady, and read with a flute-like voice, softened and checked by emotion.

Mr. JOHNSON, of New York city, followed, saying that he had always been known as a peace man, but he could not quarrel with men whose sympathy for the oppressed led them to take up the sword. He would rather find fault with those so-called ministers of God, whom William Lloyd Garrison had exhorted, years ago, to preach against slavery. Had it not been for their silence and the shameful indifference of the people towards those who are in bonds, there would have been no occasion for any such raid as that of Brown's, or for any such sacrifice.

Mr. SPRING said that they could not exhibit the faces of the deceased, but would pass around a photograph of Stevens. He would ask if such a man, as Stevens' portrait showed him to be, deserved death, and what was to be thought of the people who slew him?

The body of Stevens was then placed upon a hearse, and that of Hazlett upon a common farm wagon, and the whole company followed in funeral procession, the bell tolling as the procession moved.

The Socialist Cemetery is about half a mile from the buildings, upon a slight elevation, in the midst of a scraggy wood of cedars, pines and scrub oaks. Stevens and Hazlett were buried in the Virginia coffins, in separate shallow graves, in the midst of a small grove, and about three or four feet apart. The company threw evergreens upon the coffins as they defiled past on their way back to the house.

The Conflict in Wisconsin.

Sherman M. Booth has been re-arrested by the U. S. authorities on the old charge of assisting fugitive slaves to escape.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court has denied him a writ of habeas corpus, and considerable excitement is the consequence. There is no doubt that Judge Dixon, who has exercised the power of the bench in this case, Judge Paine being disqualified by being Booth's former counsel, will be routed at the April election, for the people of Wisconsin are strongly "State rights." It is stated that Booth's counsel propose to arrest Judge Miller and the U. S. Marshal for false imprisonment—thus giving a "Roland for an Oliver"—*Cleveland Analyst*.

Habeas Corpus.

Late intelligence from Madison, informs us that the Supreme Court has refused the habeas corpus in the case of Booth. Judge Paine refused to sit in the case, and Judges Cole and Dixon disagreeing, (the former in the affirmative, and the latter in the negative,) the writ was denied. This, of course, effects on principle—but leaves everything in connection with the principle in statu quo. On the prisoner, its effect will be to compel the fulfilment of the sentence.

What occult causes may have been at work to produce this result we know not. The causes on the face of it, are the delicacy of Judge Paine, and the mistake of putting Dixon on the bench. The latter mistake will probably be remedied in the coming election. The other will probably exist to impair the usefulness of the Judge, during his term, unless he should be chivalrous enough to give the people a chance to remedy the mistake, which with the best intentions they committed.

Judge Paine made the following remarks in connection with the matter, giving, it seems to us, the wrong cause the benefits of his doubts:

Justice Paine—In respect to this application, I will say, that it is my opinion at present, that I am not qualified to sit during its consideration. I have not thoroughly examined all the bearings which the rule as to the duties of a Judge, who has been of counsel in the case, might have on my course. It undoubtedly extends to all the stages of the same case. And though an application for a writ of habeas corpus, is not, strictly speaking, the same case, yet, the validity of the judgment obtained in the case where I was of counsel, may be tested, it seems to me that all the reasons why I should not sit in the case itself, now prevail. Unless further examination shall modify my views, I shall take no part in the examination of this application.—*Fond du lac Com.*

The news from Madison informs us that Judge Paine refuses to sit in the habeas corpus with reference to Booth, leaving the decision of the case to Cole and Dixon. The result of this will probably be the ultimate failure of the application. The State-Rights men of the State have got themselves into a peculiar position. With a majority of from seven to twelve thousand in the State, they are nevertheless paralyzed and powerless. They themselves appear to have made the mistake of electing a man to the bench who finds himself unable to be of any service in the matter for which almost exclusively he was preferred to many others; while the Governor finds he made a mistake with reference to his appointee. Doubtless the delicacy of Judge Paine will be appreciated by the profession, but we fear the great mass of the people will fail to understand it. He is not ruled of by any statute of positive prohibition. He was once counsel for Booth in connection with this matter, though not upon this particular point, if we understand it, and retires in obedience to custom or common law. He was elected, however, with special reference to his views on this point—his views are no better known nor defined than those of Cole who has once decided in this case. Booth, personally, for whom he was counsel, has the smallest possible relation in his person or interests to this case, but it is a great principle involving the interests mainly of the whole people. So it looks to us. It cannot fail, we think, to puzzle any man who takes a common-sense instead of a "professional" view of the case to find a reason for Judge Paine absenting himself from the bench on this important occasion.—*Wisconsin Free Democrat*.

WISCONSIN.—The Captain of the "Union Guards" of Milwaukee having openly declared that he would not obey the orders of the State Executive in case of a collision with the U. S. Court, Gov. Randall promptly disbanded the company, which was composed chiefly of Irishmen. This looks as if Wisconsin had not yet concluded to bend the knee to the Slave Oligarchy.

SEWING MACHINES EXEMPT FROM ATTACHMENT.—An act exempting from attachment, one sewing machine, not exceeding \$100, in actual use, by the debtor, or the family of the debtor, has passed both branches of the Legislature of Massachusetts, and received the approval of the Governor.

INTERFERENCE.—It is proposed in Atlanta Ga., that a subscription be raised by the females there, for the relief of the white girls and women in Massachusetts, who are asking for higher wages. The person who makes the proposition, offers to contribute \$100 to start with.

So say the papers. We fear the "girls and women in Massachusetts," will receive little help from that quarter, though Massachusetts has no laws to prevent them from receiving and holding property, or for enabling their employers to seize and pocket their money. Nor would any Georgian be lynched, imprisoned, or hanged, if he should appear openly in Massachusetts with the donation. We should be glad to have such a Southern precedent, for "interfering with the domestic institutions" of other States. The right of interfering when "girls and women" in Georgia, get no wages at all, is made very apparent by this movement.

For "The Principia."

NECESSITY OF PRAYER.

BRO. GOODALL.—I wish the subject of prayer could be more and more investigated in its vital connection with our success in the Anti-Slavery cause, Political reform, &c. I was glad to see your article on it, in a late number of The Principia, and that the enquiries of your Correspondent leading to it, had been made.

The truth is, every step of advance in regenerating our Government, putting away Slavery, and purifying the Church, must come, in answer to prayer. God will be inquired of, by His people to do these things for them; and He will do them no farther than they look to Him in real, earnest, believing prayer for it. This is His revealed plan: "Ask, and ye shall receive." "According to your faith be it unto you." Not that God does not use other means; not that we are to act less; not that we are to reason, agitate and proclaim truth less; not that we are to rebuke sin and wrong, expose oppression and adhere to the right, any the less; but only, that we should pray a great deal more, and with a far more child-like and unwavering faith, that God will hear.

And let me say, God has answered our prayers for John Brown (as your Correspondent refers to him) in a remarkable manner. I felt that He would, as his case was pending, and now feel that He has—not indeed in preserving his life a few days, that were a small matter. But in enabling him to die a Christian hero; to rejoice in death on the gallows, rather than life, when he saw it would best serve to break oppression; and thus, even tho' mistaken in his means, impressing deeply the whole land with the dread spirit of slavery on the one hand, and with a noble example of self-sacrifice to remove it, on the other.

Had not God's people been struggling in prayer for John Brown, in private, and in public, waking up a general interest and supplication in his behalf, and putting his whole case, with the cause he sought, in God's hand, pleading with Him to overrule in all its difficulties for the best, and expecting Him to do it, had not this been the case, then John Brown had been rejoiced with no such consoling evidence that his death was gain; nor had that deep, dooming sensation against slavery, which from his death has thrilled the world, ever have been felt. Instead of it, the community and whole land had been unmoved, and he had died rather as a common culprit. Oh! how truly has God answered prayer in that case.

And so it is true, that "argument with God in prayer is required, before he will interpose." Not that it is required in order to change God. The change required is in us. We need to present, and turn over our wants and circumstances, and arguments in prayer before Him, till we see and feel most deeply our wants, the wants of the wronged, the enslaved of a dying world; and then we are prepared to appreciate the blessing sought.

Were God to grant blessings, without this change in His people, then they would not be blest in receiving them, nor He honored in the giving. It would be like giving bread to those who did not hunger; and your statement, Bro. G.—that God's plan "secures His varying treatment of His crea-

tures, corresponding to their changes of character and position toward Him," is one full of meaning, and which may be shown to be true, by many striking answers to prayer. We must want great things done for the deliverance of the oppressed, and the salvation of many, and truly depend on God to do them, and then they will be done. I send this to enclose a dollar for the paper, hoping yet to send more.

ONORGA, Ill., Feb. 29, '60.

Yours truly,

L. FOSTER.

Family Miscellany.

For The Principia.

THE DYING CHILD.

All night I lay pressing
A loved form to my heart,
Saying, fondly caressing,
My child, must we part?

But the soft hand grew colder,
Reaching up to my eyes,
Though closer I fold her,
With heaviest sighs;

And the sweet breath came slower—
O roses of June!
Have ye jealousy toward her,
That she goeth so soon?

Yet quiet she dreameth,
And I stir not, for fear,
So faint the life seemeth
In her breast to appear.

O! Light of the morning,
Break through the thick gloom!
Ah! surely 'tis dawning,
There's light in my room!

No—'Tis an angel that bendeth
Above my low bed,
The angel that tendeth
Our babes in our stead!

And he pitying gazes
Calm in my sad eyes,
That the doomed heart raises
In mournful surprise.

I know who hath sent him—
That glory complete,—
Knowing naught can prevent him,
Speak not, nor entreat.

Yet the anguish now blinds me,
Which no loving voice calms—
The morning light finds me,
No child in my arms.

E.

For the Principia.

NELL SAVAGE,

OR THE "HATEFUL" LITTLE GIRL.

"Nell Savage, come here!" exclaimed Miss Baker, energetically, as she paused a moment in the midst of a long demonstration on the black-board, while the guilty little culprit, stepped reluctantly forward.

"What were you doing?"

"She's all the time rubbing out my sums, and pulling my hair, and pricking me," spoke up a very indignant little maiden, of some ten summers, her dark eyes flashing with anger.

"Nell Savage, you're the worst girl in school! I don't know what I shall do with you! You're all the time getting into trouble with some one. Come here!" And, with a half weary, half impatient sigh, Miss Baker led the child to an unoccupied seat in one corner of the large school-room. "There! don't stir from that place to-day."

And while Miss Baker concludes her exposition of square root, we will claim a visitor's privilege of scanning more closely the phiz of the little offender. It is not peculiarly attractive, we must admit; at least not at present. There is a sullen, obstinate expression, which repels the observer. The full, rounded forehead, is contracted into a scowl; the black eyes do not laugh and sparkle, like 'most little girl's at eight, but are dull and gloomy. The skin is dark, the face thin, and features sharp. Such is the "hateful girl" of Public School No.—. For so, all she girls call her, and Miss Baker does not deny it, and Nell herself seems to accept the proposition as an axiom. If anything bad was done, Nell is at the bottom of it, of course, and everybody wonders why she isn't like other girls, and what can make her love to be "so hateful."

On this occasion, Nell busied herself with scratching on the desk with a pin, or sending little paper ball telegrams to scholars in different portions of the room, where they met with divers receptions, according to the natures and inclinations of the recipients. Recess came, and a joyous band ran, shouting and laughing, into the play-ground, while Nell remained in her temporary prison to watch them from the window. There was a rosy, merry, happy group of little girls jumping rope, at one side, and another swinging in that beautiful new swing, that had just been put up, and all seemed quite delighted with themselves, and each other. And as they ran, and jumped, and swung, and shook back the flowing locks, and their cheeks glowed, and eyes sparkled, Nell sat gazing, half sadly, half sourly at them, wondering why she was so different from everybody else, wishing she could be like other folks, and love people, and have people love her! But she wasn't and couldn't be; she was different, somehow—so everybody seemed to think, and she supposed it must be so.

Nell grew uneasy. She was tired of being alone; tired of her thoughts. She felt a sudden impulse to be in the happy group. She glanced cautiously around. Miss Baker was bending over her desk, absorbed in writing; the school-room was on the first story, and in a moment the window-sash was quietly lifted, and Nell was in the yard. "If there isn't that Nell Savage! Go away; we don't want you!"

"Get away, quick, I say!" exclaimed Ellen Morris, who was just in the act of "running under" one of the girls in the swing. "Quick, if you don't want to get knocked over!"

Nell stood still in sullen silence, and received a push, as Ellen ran past, and tossed her shouting burden in the air. Nell turned slowly toward the group with the jumping rope, and sat down on a stone to watch them.

"Get away Nell; you're right in the way!" chimed the silvery voice of Carrie Weston, as she skipped out, for another to run in.

"I won't."

The glowing faces all darkened as they turned on Nell, and Nell, in revenge, sat and threw little stones at the rope to "trip" the jumpers, till the school bell rang, and put an end to their games.

"Mother, I never did see anybody that loved to be hateful, like that little Nell Savage," exclaimed Carrie Weston, after she had hung up her light shawl, and shaker bonnet, in the closet, and settled down in a cozy rocking chair, near the window, with her crotchet work. "I shouldn't think it would make her happy—it wouldn't me!" she continued, rocking away, and making her fingers fly over the "chain," and "plain" stitches of the new tidy.

"Then, I suppose you are always very amiable, and placid?"

"Well, only when I'm very much provoked, and have occasion to be."

"But, perhaps Nell is very much provoked, and has occasion to be."

"Why, no she hasn't, as I can see. We would all treat her well enough, if she would only be like anybody. She is the queerest little image I ever saw. She doesn't seem to love anybody, nor anything. She is so sour and sullen. She isn't like a little girl."

"Do you know anything about her—who she is?"

"No; only that she comes to our school, and is always giving somebody trouble. Miss Baker herself, says she is the worst girl in school."

"Is she a good scholar?"

"She might be. She learns very quick, when she has a mind to. She was through the Primer and into the Reader, sooner than any other girl. Yes; she might be real smart," said Carrie, musingly. "But nobody likes her. I am almost sorry for her sometimes, but then I don't know what to do. If any one does anything good natured to her, she doesn't seem to know how to take it."

"Do you know how she lives? Has she parents, brothers, and sisters?"

"I don't know. I never heard her speak of any. I guess her folks are poor; she doesn't dress very well, and always has a kind of a pinched up look."

"Carrie, suppose you had no father and mother, and lived with somebody who did not love you, and whom you could not love. Suppose, instead of a pleasant home, and plenty of friends, and everything comfortable, you knew nothing

of life but eating, and drinking, and sleeping, and going to school, where you were not welcomed, and returning to a lonely, cheerless dwelling, where none loved you. Do you think you would be so full of sunshine as you are now?"

"No! No! I would never be happy in the world! But do you suppose it is so with Nell Savage? I never thought of that. O, Nell—poor Nellie! I will be good to you!" And the quick, impulsive little girl, buried her face in her hands, and burst into tears.

Nell Savage did not run skipping off homeward, like the other girls, but lagged slowly along, with her spelling book in her hand, till she reached the small, dilapidated, wooden building which she called home. She went down the steps into the basement, wearing the same old school look of sullen endurance upon her face.

"Humph; got home, have ye?" exclaimed a large woman with a very red face, looking up from her wash tub. "Now go to the grocery and get me some soap, and don't let the grass grow under your feet neither! Little plague, I'll get something out of you for once!" she muttered, as she bent over her work again.

Nell did not seem inclined to obey the injunction about the grass, for it was a long time before she returned, and when she did, she only raised the window, threw in the required article, and darted off again, almost before the vociferous calls and threats could reach her ear. It was dark before she returned, and she slipped quietly into the hall and toward the stairs, hoping to reach her little room in the garret, without detection. But the woman had caught a glimpse of her at the window, and soon seized her by the arm, and shook her violently, showering her with a torrent of maledictions.

"Let me alone, I say!" demanded Nell, when she could get breath to speak. "I hate you! you ugly old thing!"

"I'll teach you to talk to your mother that way!" persisted the woman, pulling her into the room.

"You ain't my mother."

"Humph! Don't know who is then! Only 'un you've got, I reckon. 'Nuff sight better'n that woman! Yer father never'd a took to drink, if—"

"Stop!" And the excited child snatched herself away, caught up a glass from the table, threw it at the woman, and made her escape to the garret, just as the wretched husband and father, entered the room.

Nell threw herself upon the bed, and gave way to a flood of hot, angry tears. She sobbed more and more violently, till she choked and strangled; and when she paused a moment, it was only to burst into a wilder, and more violent paroxysm of grief. At last she became more quiet. That simple word "mother," brought up a sweet memory; the only soothing one the poor, almost embittered little heart had ever known. She just remembered a face, a beautiful face, the only beautiful one she ever saw, because the only one that had ever looked lovingly into hers. Seldom did that face come up before poor Nellie, but when it did, it brought comfort and peace. She saw it now—the dark eyes beamed lovingly upon her, she heard the sweet tones saying, "My little one," and she was lulled to slumber.

About midnight Nell awoke. She was hot and restless. The sweet dream was gone, and she felt tired, and wanted something, she did not know what. She could not get to sleep, so she crept to the one little window through which the moonlight glimmered faintly. The night was warm, and she leaned out, and looked up with wonder at the stars that beamed down so mildly upon her. She wished she was one of them! Would they love her? She wished anybody would love her. Oh! why was she not like other little girls? Why didn't she have a real father and mother, and brothers and sisters—and why was she "hateful?" She wished she wasn't! And why—why—Oh, so many questions that couldn't be answered, crowded upon the poor little brain, beneath the light of those mild stars!

[TO BE CONCLUDED]

Dead yet Living.

The cedar is most useful when dead. It is the most productive when its place knows it no more. There is no timber like it. Firm in the grain, and capable of the finest polish, the tooth of no insect will touch it, and Time himself can hardly destroy it. Diffusing a perpetual fragrance through the chambers which it ceils, the worm will not corrode the look which it protects, nor the moth corrupt

the garment which it guards—All but immortal itself, it transfuses its aromanthine qualities to the objects around it. Every Christian is useful in his life, but the goodly cedars are the most useful afterwards. Luther is dead, but the Reformation lives. Calvin is dead, but his vindication of God's free and sovereign grace will never die.—Knox, Melville, and Henderson are dead, but Scotland still retains a Sabbath and a Christian peasantry, a Bible in every house, and a school in every parish.—Bunyan is dead, but his bright spirit still walks the earth in its "Pilgrim's Progress." Baxter is dead, but souls are still quickened by the "Saint's Rest," Cowper is dead, but the "golden apples" are still as fresh as when newly gathered in the "silver basket" of the Olney Hymns. Elliott is dead, but the missionary enterprise is young. Henry Martyn is dead, but who can count the apostolic spirits who, phoenix-wise, have started from his funeral pile? Howard is dead, but modern philanthropy is only commencing its career. Raikes is dead, but the Sabbath-schools go on. Wilberforce is dead, but the negro will find for ages a protector in his memory.—Rev. James Hamilton.

POVERTY NOT SO GREAT A CURSE.

If there is anything in the world that a young man should be more grateful for than another, it is the poverty which necessitates his starting in life under very great disadvantages. Poverty is one of the best tests of human quality in existence. A triumph over it is like graduating with honor from West Point. It demonstrates stuff and stamina. It is a certificate of labor faithfully performed. A young man who cannot stand this test is not good for anything. He can never rise above a drudge or a pauper.—A young man who cannot feel his will harden as the yoke of poverty presses upon him, and his pluck rise with every difficulty that poverty throws in his way may as well retire into some corner, and hide himself. Poverty saves thousands more than it ruins, for it only ruins those who are not particularly worth saving, while it saves multitudes of those wealth would have ruined. If any young man who reads this letter is so unfortunate as to be rich I give him my pity. I pity you, my rich young friend, because you are in danger. You lack one great stimulus to effort and excellence, which your poor companion possesses. You will be very apt, if you have a soft spot in your head, to think yourself above him, and that sort of thing makes you mean and injures you. With full pockets and full stomach, and good linen and broadcloth on your back, your heart and soul plethoric, in the race of life you will find yourself surpassed by poor young men, before you know it.

No, my boy, if you are poor, thank God and take courage; for He intends to give you a chance to make something of yourself. If you had plenty of money, ten chances to one it would spoil you for all useful purposes. Do you lack education? Remember that education, like some other things, does not consist in the multitude of things a man possesses.—What can you do? That is the question. You can get the use of a few good books, and be your own teacher. Self-taught men never fail to make their mark in the world, while multitudes of the College-learned, shows no evidence of it, but their diplomas.

ENCOURAGING A NEWSPAPER.

The following incident illustrates pretty forcibly the idea that some people seem to have of encouraging newspapers:—

The editor and publisher of a paper in one of our inland cities, had, a few years ago, among his subscribers, quite a prominent individual of the place, who had been a constant reader of the paper since the commencement of its publication, but who had never paid a penny for subscription.

The collector of bills having returned that against the delinquent to his employer as one impossible to be converted into cash, the editor resolved to give the party in question a broad hint as to his remissness, the first time an opportunity should occur in public. He did not have to wait long, for in a few days, he discovered his negligent patron seated in the office of the principal hotel, surrounded by quite a group of his friends and disposing of cigars and other little luxuries sufficient to have liquidated at least one year's subscription. When the laugh at the last joke had subsided, the editor approached the group, and, after the usual salutation to his subscriber, remarked—

"Colonel, you have had my paper now for five years, and have never paid for it, although the bill has frequently been sent. I should like my pay for it."

"Pay!" ejaculated the Colonel, with genuine or well feigned astonishment; "did you say pay?"

"Certainly," was the reply; "you have had the paper, and I want the pay for it."

"Pay!" said the Colonel again; "why, it can't be you expect me to pay anything for that paper. Why I only took the blamed thing to encourage you?"

The laugh from the circle of listeners to this dialogue came in here, like the bursting of a bomb-shell—*Prairie Home.*

We are beginning to fear that a good many people are taking the *Principia* only to "encourage it."

EARLY IMPRESSIONS.—"Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." No, whether he is trained to walk in the narrow or the broad way, he rarely, if ever, turns aside from it. We shall illustrate the truth by an anecdote from Sir John Malcolm's "Sketches in Persia." Two English gentlemen being desirous of having a guide through a part of Persia, obtained the services of an intelligent Tartar soldier. (We need hardly remark, that these people are hereditary robbers.) The man afforded his temporary masters much useful information, and then seemed to expect that his own curiosity relative to the homes and the habits of his fellow-travellers should also be gratified. England was described to him—its rich green landscape, its venerable ruins, its magnificent rivers, its fair streams, its noble forests, with their fresh luxuriant verdure, its beautiful cities, and the great wealth of its inhabitants. He listened with delight to their account; he looked as if he drank in their words; and when they had concluded, he exclaimed vehemently, "Oh, what a noble place for plunder!"

Superintendent of the ——— Railroad(?)—But, Sir, we must have repairs on the road; the cross-ties are rotten, and the rails are broken, and we endanger the lives of passengers every day we run! President:—Confound the passengers! the road will have to do as it is. If we spend any more money on it, before the first of January, we can't make our semi-annual dividend of four per cent.

"You must not play with that little girl, my dear," said an injudicious parent.

"But, ma, I like her; she is a good little girl, and I am sure she dresses as prettily as ever I do, and she has lots of toys."

"I cannot help that, my dear," responded the foolish anti-American, "her father is a shoemaker."

"But I don't play with her father; I play with her; she ain't a shoemaker."

THE SABBATH.—This is the loveliest, brightest day of the week, to a spiritual mind. These rests refresh the soul in God, that finds nothing but turmoil in the creature. Should not this day be welcome to the soul, that sets it free to mind its own business, which has other days to attend to the business of its servant, the body? And these are a certain pledge to it of that expected freedom when it shall enter on an eternal Sabbath and rest in him for ever who is the only rest of the soul.—*Leighton.*

It cuts one sadly to see the grief of old people; they've no way of working it off; and the new spring brings no new shoots out on the withered tree.

The habit of being always employed is a great safeguard through life, as well as essential to the culture of every virtue.

The Soul is a prisoner that always kills its jailer when it makes its escape.

Prosperity is a blessing to the good, but a curse to the evil.

Better to be upright with poverty, than wicked with plenty.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the <i>Principia</i> :	
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols.,	\$1 50
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol.,	\$1 00
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol.,	\$0 75
TERMS CASH.	

P. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.